3: Wallace & Hoebel E-4, 5 (1933, 1945) 1952
NO6 Comanche NO6

726 horses that fell behind were abandoned. No time was lost hunting for food. If necessary, old horses were killed and consumed. Captives who retarded the speed of the retreat might be abandoned or killed. To avoid surprise, they stopped to rest for only an hour or two and then moved on again, making three or four such stops within a day. To discourage pursuit, they would take a route on which they knew there was no water. When they became very thirsty, they killed horses and drank the blood. The meager supply of water carried in buffalo paunches was rationed, well guarded, and conserved for the children and women when they were along, or for wounded warriors. Clinton Smith declares that on one occasion the warriors did without water until their throats became too swollen for them to swallow readily.[21]

After an engagement or a stealthy garnering of horses, the leader and war-bonnet wearers covered the escape with rear-guard actions. The leader designated two men to remain on fast horses some distance behind, yet close enough to signal, in order to watch the back trail. They sometimes set fire to the grass to blot out their trail against both men and dogs, or they emptied pouches of skunk musk on the trail to prevent dogs from following in pursuit. After the advent of the white trader, the rear-guard scouts carried field glasses.[22]

177 416

727 When raiders had put two or three days of safety between themselves and possible pursuers, they halted. They needed rest and the wounded required attention. In most cases there were spoils to be divided, and the division was made as soon as convenient. The leader's eyes had been open to industry, willingness, and bravery. He noted or was soon told of the actions of his followers while in battle. Unless previously agreed otherwise, to the man who had excelled he allowed first choice of the horses to be divided. Each member of the party chose in turn according to his services as determined by the chief, the cook usually having high priority. The leader took his pick of what remained. The succession of choices was repeated in the same order as before. A reputation for fairness in dividing the spoils enhanced the prestige of a war leader and gained him followers. Liberality was

[21] *Ibid.* 60.

[22] Informant: Yellowfish; see also Hoebel, *The Political Organization and Law-Ways of the Comanche Indians*, 25; C. and J. D. Smith, *op. cit.*, 34, 39, 40.

[23] Linton, *The Study of Man*, 142–43.

3:Wallace & Hoebel E-4, 5 (1933, 1945) 1952
NO6 Comanche NO6

142
291
301
416

Ten Bears, in 1872

Courtesy Bureau of American Ethnology

[facing p. 270]